



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,629	12/19/2001	Robert Alexander Mann	12560-US	9206
23553	7590	01/04/2007		
MARKS & CLERK P.O. BOX 957 STATION B OTTAWA, ON K1P 5S7 CANADA			EXAMINER MITCHELL, JASON D	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			01/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,629

Applicant(s)

MANN ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Mitchell

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-24, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-24, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17, 19-24 and 26-27 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-2, 5-17, 19-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “The Benefits of CORBA-Based Network Management” by Haggerty and Seetharaman (Haggerty) in view of “HP OpenView for Windows User Guide” (OpenView) further in view of “The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification” (CORBA).**
3. **Regarding Claims 1 and 11:** Haggerty discloses an object oriented network management and service provisioning computing environment of a network management and service provisioning system, the object oriented network management and service provisioning computing environment being coded in an object oriented statically typed language and configured to invoke polymorphic operations, the computing environment comprising:

an implementation of a single managed entity object class (pg. 76, col. 2, par. 5 ‘All objects in the model derive from one base object called a Managed Object’), the

Art Unit: 2193

single managed entity object class being run-time derivable via type derivation (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by auto discovery') into a derivation hierarchy of managed data network object types based on run-time parsed entity directives (Fig. 4) , the single management entity object class implementation further comprising an at least one executable operation having a name (pg. 76, col. 2, par. 5 'defines base attributes and operations for all objects'; pg. 75 col. 1 'resolve the name to determine the object reference');

a dictionary of operations holding a roster of operation names of operations registered with the dictionary of operations in accordance with a run-time parsed operation directive (pg. 75 col. 1 'resolve the name to determine the object reference') specified in said at least one managed data network entity specification file (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 1 "CORBA servers and objects that model the network resources") in respect of a corresponding managed data network object type, each registered operation referencing a method associated with the managed data network object type (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 5 "Naming Service ... provides the ability to bind a name to an object reference"); and

a message interpreter processing messages received from at least one network management and service provisioning software application (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 2 'integrates with OpenView');

wherein a separation is achieved between managed data network entity instances and network management and service provisioning software applications (Fig. 3), the separation enabling independent development, maintenance and troubleshooting

in providing network management and service provisioning (pg. 79, col. 1, par. 1 'ProSphere network management system ... leads to an extremely open, extensible and distributed solution'), and the run-time derivation of the single managed entity object class and invoking the operation by name minimizing the need to re-code and re-compile code in supporting new managed entity object types (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'adding support for new equipment requires only creating a new object definition, which fits into the model').

4. Haggerty does not explicitly disclose a parser/lexical analyzer for processing managed data network entity specification/directives, but does disclose that 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by Auto discovery' (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2).

5. OpenView teaches that its auto discovery feature reads a 'Management Information Base (MIB) file' (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager) to retrieve data regarding the device (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

Parsing and Lexical analysis are both fundamental steps required to load a datafile in the manner described (p 5-17 'adds MIB's to the Manager's database'). Thus one of ordinary skill would recognize that Haggerty incorporates a 'parser/lexical analyzer for processing managed data network entity specification/directives'.

6. Further, Haggerty does not disclose polymorphic operation invocation or use of a call to an 'invoke' function which takes an operation name as a parameter. However, Haggerty does disclose "using only the standard CORBA functionality [to implement] the Event Service and Name Service" (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 3).

7. CORBA teaches a single invoke function configured to cause the execution of at least one operation having a name via a function call to the invoke function using the name of the operation as a parameter to the invoke function (7.2.1 create_request; 7.2.3 invoke); and

a dictionary of operations holding a roster of operation names (10.4.3 Interface Repository Objects 'InterfaceDef: an interface definition; it contains lists of ... operations'); and providing run time support for polymorphic operation invocation (Section 9.2.3.7 'The copy operation ... is polymorphic'; and Section 10.3.1 'Interface repositories ... manipulate the type information at run time');

8. It would, at least, have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Haggerty, OpenView and CORBA in order to provide more a more flexible configuration management tool (pg. 74, col. 1, par. 7 'provide customers with an easy means to configure and monitor GDC equipment').

9. **Regarding Claim 12:** Haggerty discloses a method of invoking an operation by name at run-time in respect of a run-time derived managed data network object type in

Art Unit: 2193

performing network management and service provisioning, the method comprising steps of:

loading at run-time at least one managed data network entity specification file (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by auto discovery');

deriving at run-time a single managed entity object class into a managed entity object type derivation hierarchy of at least one managed data network object type via type derivation in accordance with at least one entity directive (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by auto discovery');

registering with a dictionary of operations at run-time at least one operation name specified in the managed data network entity specification file (pg. 75 col. 1 'resolve the name to determine the object reference') via an operation directive, the operation name corresponding to an operation implemented by the derived managed data network object type (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by auto discovery'); and

processing at least one message received at run-time from at least one network management and service provisioning software application (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 2 'integrates with OpenView') by invoking the registered operation at run-time (pg. 75 col. 1 'resolve the name to determine the object reference');

wherein separation is achieved between managed data network entities and software applications (Fig. 3), the separation enabling independent development,

Art Unit: 2193

maintenance and troubleshooting in providing network management and service provisioning (pg. 79, col. 1, par. 1 'ProSphere network management system ... leads to an extremely open, extensible and distributed solution'), and the run-time derivation of the single managed entity object class and invoking the operation by name minimizing the need to re-code and re-compile code in supporting new managed entity object types (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'adding support for new equipment requires only creating a new object definition, which fits into the model').

10. Haggerty does not explicitly disclose a parser for processing managed data network entity specifications, but does disclose that 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by Auto discovery' (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2).

11. OpenView teaches that its auto discovery feature reads a 'Management Information Base (MIB) file' (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager) to retrieve data regarding the device (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

Parsing is a fundamental step required to load a datafile in the manner described (p 5-17 'adds MIB's to the Manager's database'). Thus one of ordinary skill would recognize that Haggerty incorporates a 'parser' for processing managed data network entity specifications'.

12. Further, Haggerty does not disclose polymorphic operation invocation or use of a call to an 'invoke' function which takes an operation name as a parameter. However, Haggerty does disclose "using only the standard CORBA functionality [to implement] the Event Service and Name Service" (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 3).

13. CORBA teaches invoking a registered operation at run-time by the corresponding operation name registered with the dictionary of operations on an instance of the derived managed data network object type (7.2.1 create_request) via a function call to an invoke function implemented by the single managed entity object class, the invoke function taking the name of the operation as a parameter (7.2.3 invoke); and

run- time lookups of operation names in the dictionary of operation names providing run- time support for polymorphic operation invocation (Section 9.2.3.7 'The copy operation ... is polymorphic'; and Section 10.3.1 'Interface repositories ... manipulate the type information at run time'),

14. It would, at least, have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Haggerty, OpenView and CORBA in order to provide more a more flexible configuration management tool (pg. 74, col. 1, par. 7 'provide customers with an easy means to configure and monitor GDC equipment').

15. **Regarding Claim 2:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Haggerty does not explicitly disclose the derivation of a managed data network object type

includes the specification of at least one attribute. However he does disclose that the object being derived from the specification allows for attributes (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'the derived objects ... implement most of their properties and functions').

16. OpenView teaches a specification which includes at least on attribute (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB')

17. Accordingly it would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include specification of at least one attribute in the specification.

18. **Regarding Claim 6:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further while Haggerty does not explicitly disclose at least one attribute directive includes an attribute specification, he does disclose that the object being derived from the specification allows for attributes (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'the derived objects ... implement most of their properties and functions').

19. OpenView teaches an attribute directive includes an attribute specification (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB')

Art Unit: 2193

20. Accordingly it would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include at least one directive specifying of at least one attribute.

21. **Regarding Claim 7:** The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated; further while Haggerty does not explicitly disclose the attribute specification further specifies managed data network object type inheritance, he does disclose that the object being derived from the specification allows for inheritance (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'higher level objects implement most of their properties and functions'). It would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further specify managed data network object type inheritance.

22. **Regarding Claim 8:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses a plug-in registry for run-time registration of at least one plug-in brokering access to network management and service provisioning enabling technologies (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM'), the network management and service provisioning enabling technologies include support for at least one of a persistence method and a persistence entity (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects ... contain information pertaining to addressing, type, uniqueness, resources, and status').

23. **Regarding Claim 9:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses the managed data network entity specification file further comprises a command sequence directive specifying a command sequence to be followed in using a specific registered enabling technology (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects ... contain information pertaining to addressing, type, uniqueness, resources, and status').

24. **Regarding Claim 10:** The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses the framework further comprising at least one registered enabling-technology-specific lexical analyzer stub for interpreting at least one enabling-technology-specific directive (pg. 78, col. 1, par. 1 'The ProSphere user interfaces use the compiled stubs from IDL to interact with the objects').

25. **Regarding Claim 13:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses processing the at least one received message, the method comprises a further step of populating a containment hierarchy of managed data network object type instances at run-time corresponding to field installed data network equipment (Fig. 4).

26. **Regarding Claim 14:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses run-time registering at run-time with a plug-in registry at least one plug-in brokering access to at least on network management and service provisioning enabling technology (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

27. **Regarding Claim 15:** The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein run-time registering the at least one plug-in, the method further comprises a prior step of: selecting the at least one plug-in for registration thereof (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

28. While Haggerty does not explicitly disclose selecting the at least one plug-in for registration thereof, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a user with the ability to select the at least one plug-in for registration thereof, instead of having to re-define the managed data network entity prior to adding it to the MOM.

29. **Regarding Claim 16:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses a step of: run-time loading the at least one managed data network entity specification file (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

30. **Regarding Claim 17:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses run-time loading the at least one managed data network entity specification, the method further comprises a prior step of: selecting the at least one managed data

Art Unit: 2193

network entity specification file (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

31. While Haggerty does not explicitly disclose selecting the at least one managed data network entity specification, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a user with the ability to select the at least one managed data network entity specification instead of having to re-define the managed data network entity prior to adding it to the MOM.

32. **Regarding Claim 19:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein deriving the single managed entity object class via type derivation, the method further comprises a step of setting at least one attribute (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'the derived objects ... implement most of their properties and functions').

33. **Regarding Claim 20:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein prior to processing the at least one message received from the at least one software application, the method further comprises a step of: registering the at least one software application with the network management and service provisioning computing environment framework (Fig. 2, ProSphere Application Objects').

34. **Regarding Claim 21:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein processing the at least one received message; the method further

comprises a step of: implementing a directive specified in the at least one managed data network entity specification file using a lexical analyzer stub associated with a corresponding plug-in (pg. 78, col. 1, par. 1 'The ProSphere user interfaces use the compiled stubs from IDL to interact with the objects').

35. **Regarding Claim 22:** the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein implementing the directive, the method further comprises a step of: deriving a containment hierarchy by instantiating managed data network object type (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

36. **Regarding Claim 23:** The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein implementing the directive the method further comprises a step of: effecting a change in a network state of a managed data transport network in a realm of management (pg. 78, col. 1, par. 1 'The ProSphere user interfaces use the compiled stubs from IDL to interact with the objects').

37. **Regarding Claim 24:** The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein subsequent to processing the at least one message received by the framework; the method further comprises a step of: sending a message to the software application (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 2 'integrates with OpenView').

38. **Regarding Claim 26:** The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses making a dictionary entry in the dictionary of operations, (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 5 'provides the ability to bind a name to an object reference').

39. **Regarding Claim 27:** The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein making the dictionary entry in the dictionary, the method further comprises a step of using name spaces techniques to associate each operation name with a corresponding derived managed data network object type with corresponding registered methods (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 5 'provides the ability to bind a name to an object reference').

40. **Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "The Benefits of CORBA-Based Network Management" by Haggerty and Seetharaman (Haggerty) in view of "HP OpenView for Windows User Guide" (OpenView) further in view of "The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification" (CORBA) and further in view of US 6,058,445 to Chari et al. (Chari).**

41. **Regarding Claim 3:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated further the Haggerty-OpenView-CORBA combination does not explicitly teach the managed data network entity specification file includes at least one human readable file. However the OpenView reference does teach a managed data network entity specification file (pg. 1-

7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

42. Chari teaches 'MIBs are formally described using an abstract syntax notation set out in ISO 8824' (col. 10, lines 64-67; also see cols. 11-80).

43. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time to write OpenView's MIB files (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB') human readable as taught in Chari in order to adhere to the standard (col. 10, lines 64-67).

44. **Regarding Claim 4:** The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated further; OpenView teaches that each human-readable file is an attribute file holding attributes (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

Response to Arguments

45. **Applicant's arguments filed 10/6/06 with respect to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 1-17, 19-24 and 26-27, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

46. Applicant argues:

A) That “Examiner has not addressed” and “There is no suggestion or teaching that a single file be used to house directives for run-time derivation (hence including device information variables and class definitions) and also operation directives to support run-time invocation and execution of registered operations.”

B) That “The combination of technologies assembled by the Examiner, and particularly the picking and choosing of disparate, and in some cases proprietary and internal features of OpenView, and CORBA, following the Examiner’s observation that Openview an CORBA are commonly referenced in a single paper by Haggerty is ... a result of particular understanding by the Examiner in combination with hindsight, due to familiarity with the present application and its teachings.”

47. Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

A) Claims 1, 11 and 12 do not appear to recite the limitations asserted and argued by Applicant. Specifically, the claims make no recitation of “a single file [housing] directives for run-time derivation ... and also operation directives to support run-time invocation and execution of registered operations”. Further Applicant has not indicated any distinction between the ‘entity directives’ and the ‘operation directives’. It is Examiner’s position that an ‘operation directive’ referencing methods of an entity would given it’s broadest reasonable meaning constitute an ‘entity directive’.

Regardless, OpenView’s “device settings and other device information” (pg. 1-7) clearly provide enough information to build a “roster of operation names ... referencing a method associated with the ... object type” (e.g. pg. 5-1 “Operations on MIB-II

variables, such as egg and transmission, will not return values from devices supporting only MIB-1”) and thus anticipate the claimed “operation directive”.

Further, Open view discloses “some MIBs have dependencies on MIBs higher in the tree” (pg. 5-19) and that a dependent MIB’s “dependent relationship ... requires that [the parent] also be compiled” (pg. 5-20) thus it would, at least, have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a (entity) directive requiring prior compilation of a parent MIB in a dependent MIB.

B) Haggerty discloses “The topology objects are created through OpenView ... Autodiscovery’ (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2), OpenView uses the MIB’s to perform these actions (e.g. pg. 1-2 “Manufacturers who have designed there devices to be managed through OpenView can provide description of there devices ... stored in a device definition file”; pg. 5-1 “The OpenView SNMP Manager uses information form MIB files ... to build its own database”).

Haggerty also discloses “using Orbix ... as the underlying ORBs ... using only the standard CORBA functionality ... we have implemented ... the Event Service and name Service” (see, pg. 78, col. 2, par. 3) and thus provides ample motivation to implement the Naming services using CORBA ORBs.

Further it is noted that Applicant has provided no evidence that Examiner used improper hindsight in establishing the grounds of rejection, other than the broad statement that none of the references “teach or suggest the combination of their particular features” (see e.g. MPEP 2141 II).

Conclusion

48. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

49. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2193

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jason Mitchell
12/13/06



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100